DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 973 HE 023 035

TITLE Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology For the California State University. A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Committee. Report 89-22.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE Jun 89

NOTE 15p.

AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985 (free).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Compensation (Remuneration); Educational Finance; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Higher Education; Law Schools; Methods; *Public Policy; State Boards of Education; State Universities; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Salaries

IDENTIFIERS *California; California State University

ABSTRACT

Supplemental Budget Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission to convene its salary methodology advisory committee in order to evaluate whether the estimated average salaries at California State University's (CSU's) comparison institutions should be adjusted for the full effect, rather than the existing partial effect, of their law school faculty. The Commission was also asked to determine the appropriateness of continuing to include law school faculty from comparison institutions when computing the annual parity figure for CSU faculty. Several sections are as follows: reasons for proposed revision; previous changes in the Commission's methodology for computing faculty salaries; the issue of law faculty and CSU's methodology; impact of law school faculty on the parity figure; options and recommendation of the advisory committee; existing criteria for selecting comparison institutions; and special criteria for selecting new comparison institutions. An appendix discusses state university faculty salary methodology. Contains 3 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED312978

REVISIONS TO THE COMMISSION'S FACULTY SALARY METHODOLOGY FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

report of faculty salaries
all law faculty be removed
from the methodology used
for computing the State Uni
versity's parity figure

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 023 035

Summary

Supplemental Budget Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act directed the Commission to convene its salary methodology advisory committee in order to evaluate whether the estimated average salaries at the State University's comparison institutions should be adjusted for the full effect, rather than the existing partial effect, of their law school faculty. The Commission was also directed to determine the appropriateness of retaining any effect of law school faculty employed by these comparison institutions when computing a final faculty State University salary parity figure, and to provide a justification for it.

The advisory committee recommended to the Commission is "that for purposes of reporting comparable 'academic' salary information for both the State University and its comparison institutions in its annual report of faculty salaries, all law faculty be removed from the methodology used for computing the State University's parity figure" (p. 4). This change in the methodology would not take effect until the 1991-92 budget year, by which time the advisory committee anticipates that it can resolve the issue as to whether one or more institutions in the State University's comparison group should be replaced in order to recover either all or a portion of the revenue loss caused by the removal of the law faculty.

The Commission adopted this report at its meeting on June 26, 1989, on recommendation of its Policy Evaluation Committee. Additional copies of the report may be obtained from the Library of the Commission at (916) 322-8031. Questions about the substance of the report may be directed to Murray J. Haberman of the Commission staff at (916) 322-8001.

REVISIONS TO THE COMMISSION'S FACULTY SALARY METHODOLOGY FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
Third Floor • 1020 Twelfth Street • Sacramento, California 95814-3985

COMMISSION REPORT 89-22
PUBLISHED JUNE 1989

This report, like other publications of the California Postsecondary Education Commission, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 89-22 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Reasons for the Proposed Revision	1
Previous Changes in the Commission's Methodology for Computing Faculty Salaries	2
The Issue of Law Faculty and the State University's Methodology	3
Impact of Law School Faculty on the Parity Figure	3
Options and Recommendation of the Advisory Committee	3
Existing Criteria for Selecting Comparison Institutions	4
Special Criteria for Selecting New Comparison Institutions	6
References	6
Appendix	7

Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University

Executive summary

Supplemental Budget Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act called on the California Postsecondary Education Commission to determine the appropriateness of continuing to include law school faculty from comparison institutions when computing the annual parity figure for the California State University. Law faculty are paid on separate and higher salary scales than regular academic faculty. The Commission's Advisory Committee on the Faculty Salary Methodology has met to discuss this issue and has unanimously agreed that law faculty should *not* be included when computing the State University's parity figure, for the simple reason that the State University has no law schools. Therefore, the committee recommends to the Commission that law faculty should be removed from the State University's methodology in order that comparable "academic" salary data be analyzed and reported.

The committee has not agreed, however, if one or more of the State University's current comparison institutions should be changed to recover all or part of the revenue loss attributed to the removal of the comparison institution's law faculty -- estimated to be 0.75 percent of this year's parity figure or an amount equal to approximately $7.65 million of the instructional budget.

The State University has asked the advisory committee to recommend a change in its comparison group that will be "revenue neutral." Other members of the committee suggest that a compromise amount is more appropriate.

As prescribed in the supplemental language mandating this report, no change will take effect until the 1991-92 budget in deference to the current collective bargaining agreement between the State University and the California Faculty Association. The Commission's advisory committee intends to meet during the next several months in order to seek consensus among its members about the issue. Its recommendations will then be forwarded to the Commission, which will then review and consider them before forwarding its recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.

Reasons for the proposed revision

Each year the University of California and the California State University submit to the Commission data on faculty salaries for their institutions and for a group of their respective comparison colleges and universities On the basis of these data, the Commission develops estimates of percentage changes in salaries required to attain parity -- an amount equal to the all ranks average salary of their respective comparison groups -- for the forthcoming fiscal year

Supplemental Budget Language to the 1988-89 Budget Act (Appendix A) directed the Commission to convene its Advisory Committee on Faculty Salary Methodology in order to evaluate whether the estimated average salaries at the State University's comparison institutions should be adjusted for the full effect, rather than the existing partial effect. of law school faculty in its comparison institution group. It directed the Commission to determine the appropriateness of retaining any effect of law school faculty employed by comparison institutions when computing a final faculty salary parity figure for the State University and to provide a justification for its decision -- and to report its recommendations to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the legislative fiscal committees by April 30, 1989. The supplemental language further noted that "if any changes in the law school adjustment are found to be warranted, they shall not take effect until 1991-92."

This report responds to this Supplemental Budget Language and includes the advisory committee's recommendation to the Commission.

Previous changes in the Commission's methodology for computing faculty salaries

The current methodology by which the segments collect faculty salaries data and the Commission staff analyzes them was based on recommendations to the Commission from its Advisory Committee on Faculty Salary Methodology, which consists of representatives of the University of California, the California State University, the Department of Finance, the Office of the Legislative Analyst, and the Commission staff. Representatives of the California Faculty Association sit as observers at the committee's meetings.

The Commission's methodology for computing faculty salaries has been revised three times in recent years -- March 1985, June 1987, and February 1988 -- to reflect changes in the manner by which the parity figures are calculated and in the California State University's and University of California's group of comparison institutions.

The 1985 revisions

In 1984, the Commission convened its special advisory committee in order to design a methodology that would provide a more timely and complete analysis of information for staff at the Department of Finance -- who use the report's data in developing cost-of-living adjustments presented in the Governor's Budget -- and at the Office of the Legislative Analyst -- who use the report's data during legislative fiscal committee budget hearings.

The Committee's deliberations at that time led to a number of substantive revisions to the methodology, including creation of a new list of comparison institutions for the State University; production of only a single annual report, rather than both a preliminary and final report as called for in the earlier version of the methodology; and publication of University of California medical faculty salary information biennially rather than annually.

The Commission approved these changes in March 1985 when it adopted its report *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95*. However, several issues remained unresolved when that methodology was approved. Among them were the following:

1. How to make estimates when data are incomplete;
2. How to weight institutional data;
3. Whether to keep the salary information of the comparison institutions confidential; and
4. Which institutions to substitute for those in the State University's comparison group that were either unwilling or unable to provide timely data.

The 1987 and 1988 revisions

Early in 1987, the Commission's advisory committee met and resolved these issues; and in June, the Commission adopted its report, *Faculty Salary Methodology Revisions: Revisions of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Cost*. At the time, the University of California agreed to continue using the eight comparison institutions it had used for some 16 years, and the Commission assumed that the methodology would meet the State's needs for at least a decade.

After the University further analyzed salary trends at its eight comparison institutions later that summer, however, it determined that the economic situation, especially in the midwest, had adversely affected at least one of them -- the University of Wisconsin-Madison -- to the extent that it had fallen substantially behind other universities in the comparison group. As a consequence, "in the best interest of the University and the State," it asked the Commission that other institutions be considered for its comparison group -- in particular, the substitution of the University of Virginia for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology for Cornell University.

As part of this proposal, the University agreed to abandon requests for 1988-89 and subsequent fiscal years for "competitive edge" funds -- a percentage added to the computed parity figure for a "margin of excellence" -- noting that the existing methodology of projected lag to parity would be sufficient, given the new comparison group.

The Commission's advisory committee agreed to this proposed change in the University's group of comparison institutions, and in February 1988 the

Commission concurred when it adopted its report, *Changes in Faculty Salary Methodology*.

The issue of law faculty and the State University's methodology

In calling for this present report, the Legislature has asked the Commission to consider yet another refinement to its methodology -- the appropriateness of including law faculty in the State University's parity calculations. The issues involved in this request are difficult to resolve. They arose when the Legislative Analyst realized that the agreed-on reduction of 0.2 percent in the annual salary parity figure for the State University reflected only the difference between the old list of the State University's comparison institutions prior to March 1985 and its new list as of March 1985 and not the effect of eliminating all law school faculty in the new list.

In the Analyst's opinion, no law school faculty of any comparison institution should be included in computing the State University's parity figure, because the State University has no law schools. Furthermore, the Analyst noted that the University of California (which employs law school faculty) excludes them when calculating its parity figure.

On the other hand, State University officials noted that its old list of comparison institutions included law faculty, in that data from sources such as the American Association of University Professors included such faculty -- and the State University used these data in preparing its materials for the Commission. They therefore suggested that the only correction should be to exclude the estimated difference between the law faculty included in its old and current lists of comparison institutions. By doing so, the State University would maintain its current competitiveness. Furthermore, the current collective bargaining agreement with the faculty association is based on the methodology adopted by the Commission in June 1985, which incorporated only the marginal difference between the current and former comparison institution lists and did not exclude law school faculty entirely.

Impact of law school faculty on the parity figure

Law faculty have a significant impact on the final parity figure computed for the State University, contributing approximately 0.75 percent to the amount reported this year. In real dollars, if law faculty were completely removed from the methodology, this year's allocation for instruction at the State University would be reduced by approximately $7.65 million. (This reduction assumes a full fiscal-year cost-of-living adjustment of 4.8 percent for 1989-90 -- the amount projected by the Commission to be necessary to maintain parity with the State University's comparison group.)

In addition, law faculty in recent years have received slightly greater salary increases than their academic counterparts. If this trend continues, the impact that law faculty contribute to the overall parity amount will be even greater in subsequent years.

Options and recommendation of the advisory committee

The Commission's advisory committee met three times during a five-month period to discuss the concerns of the Legislative Analyst, the Department of Finance, and the State University. The committee reviewed several options, including:

1. Maintaining the current methodology that removes the difference of law faculty currently reported from those reported prior to March 1985 -- in other words, continuing the 0.2 percent adjustment;
2. Removing *all* comparison institution law faculty for purposes of computing the State University's parity figure, thereby reflecting the other academic salaries only;
3. Replacing one or more institutions for the purpose of recovering *all* of the loss of revenue attributed to the removal of the law faculty; or
4. Replacing one or more institutions for the purpose of recovering a *portion* of the loss of revenue attributed to their removal.

The committee was unanimous in accepting the second of these options and therefore recommends to the Commission:

> That for purposes of reporting comparable "academic" salary information for both the State University and it comparison institutions in its annual report of faculty salaries, all law faculty be removed from the methodology used for computing the State University's parity figure.

However, the committee remains divided as to whether one or more institutions in the State University's comparison group should be replaced in order to recover either all or a portion of the revenue loss attributed to the removal of the law faculty.

Representatives from the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst reiterated their assumption that all law faculty had been removed from the final parity figure when the methodology adjusted the parity figure by 0.2 percent. However, since there had been a clear misunderstanding of what the methodology was really doing (that of adjusting for the difference in law faculty from the previous and the current list), they agreed to the substitution of one or more comparison institutions to make up "a portion" of the revenue loss attributed to the removal of all law faculty from the comparison group.

State University officials, however, expressed concern that eliminating law faculty from the comparison data would deflate State Universities salaries at a time when competition for faculty nationwide will be intense. These officials also expressed the opinion that the cost of living at California campuses typically is much higher than at the comparison institution locations. They also stated that the faculty recruitment and retention situation in the 1990s would be exacerbated by the exclusion of law faculty, and thus proposed replacing several institutions on the current list with institutions as comparable to the State University as those deleted. They noted that a slightly revised list could yield a competitive salary level essentially unchanged from the current one, even though all law faculty were excluded from the calculation.

Therefore, although the State University officials agreed that excluding law faculty was appropriate for reasons of data comparability, they urged that its comparison group be modified to retain its competitive position. In other words, its current and prospective parity figures would remain undiminished in spite of the removal of law faculty.

The committee recognizes that the issue of partial or complete restitution of funds caused by the removal of law faculty remains unresolved, and it intends to meet as often as necessary in order to resolve this issue. The Supplemental Language mandating this report stated that no changes in the methodology may take place prior to 1991-92, at which time the current collective bargaining agreement between the State University and the California Faculty Association will be renegotiated. The committee anticipates that it can resolve the issue regarding the partial or complete restoration of funds lost by the removal of comparison institution law faculty before this autumn, which will leave adequate time for the enactment of any methodological changes prior to the 1991-92 budget year and prior to the opening of those collective bargaining negotiations anticipated for mid-1990.

Existing criteria for selecting comparison institutions

In anticipation of the committee's forthcoming meetings, and recognizing that as part of its discussions, one or more of the State University's comparison institutions will likely change, the committee has agreed that before any replacement institution can be considered, it will follow the five criteria set forth in the current methodology of February 1988, which include:

1. *General comparability of institutions:* Comparison institutions should reflect the mission, functions, purposes, objectives, and institutional diversity of the California State University system. Faculty expectations at the comparison institutions, in terms of pay benefits, workload, and professional responsibilities, should be relatively similar to those prevailing at the California State University. To those ends, State University comparison institutions should include those that offer a wide variety of programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels but that grant very few if any

doctoral degrees. Specifically, the 20 institutions that awarded the largest number of doctoral degrees during the ten-year period between 1973-74 and 1983-84 should be excluded. The list should include both large and small, and urban and rural institutions from each of the four major regions of the country (Northeast, North Central, South, and West). Approximately one-fourth to one-third of the institutions on the list should be private or independent colleges and universities, and none of these institutions should be staffed predominantly with religious faculty.

2. *Economic comparability of institutional location:* The comparison group, taken as a whole, should reflect a general comparability in living costs and economic welfare to conditions prevailing in California. Consequently, institutions located in very high cost areas, such as New York City, or in severely depressed areas, should not be included on the list. In order to ensure a continuing economic comparability between California and those regions in which comparison institutions are located, the Commission will periodically review such economic indicators as it considers appropriate and include the results of its surveys in its annual report on faculty salaries and fringe benefit costs.

3. *Availability of data:* Each institution should be one from which it is possible to collect salary and benefit cost data on a timely, voluntary, and regular basis. (Not all institutions are willing to provide their salary and benefit cost data, especially in the detail required for comparison purposes.)

4. *Fringe benefits:* The comparison institutions should provide fringe benefits, including a retirement program that vests in the faculty member within five years.

5. *University of California comparison institutions:* The California State University comparison group should not include any institution used by the University of California for its comparison group.

The institutions that have met these criteria and are currently used in the State University's methodology appear in Display 1 below.

Special criteria for selecting new comparison institutions

In addition to the existing criteria set forth above, the committee suggests several special criteria that

---

DISPLAY 1 Comparison Institutions of the California State University

Northeast

Bucknell University[1]
Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, Newark[2]
State University of New York, Albany
Tufts University[1]
University of Bridgeport[1,2]

South

Georgia State University[2]
North Carolina State University
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

North Central

Cleveland State University[2]
Loyola University, Chicago[1,2]
Mankato State University
Wayne State University[2]
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

West

Arizona State University[2]
Reed College[1]
University of Colorado, Denver
University of Nevada, Reno
University of Southern California[1,2]
University of Texas, Arlington

1. Independent institution.
2. Institution with law school.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

---

should be met before any replacement institution can be considered:

1. *For the eight State University comparison institutions that currently have law schools:* Current comparison institutions that have law faculty must agree to either remove their law faculty when submitting their annual salary report to the State University; or these institutions must submit a separate report for their law faculty, in order that the State University can remove such faculty data from the institution's summary data.

2. *Participation of replacement institutions.* Any proposed replacement institution that has a law school must agree to remove law faculty when reporting its data, or agree to provide its law faculty salary data separately. Furthermore, any proposed replacement institutions must strictly meet the existing criteria outlined above.

Once the advisory committee agrees on changes in the State University's comparison group of institutions, the Commission will act on this agreement and report the results to the Legislature and Governor.

References

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Methods for Calculating Salary and Fringe Benefit Cost Comparisons, 1985-86 to 1994-95: A Revision of the Commission's 1977 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs.* Commission Report 85-11. Sacramento: The Commission, March 1985.

--. *Faculty Salary Revisions: A Revision of the Commission's 1985 Methodology for Preparing Its Annual Reports on Faculty and Administrative Salaries and Fringe Benefit Costs.* Commission Report 87-27. Sacramento: The Commission, June 1987.

--. *Changes in Faculty Salary Methodology.* Commission Agenda Item 16, December 24, 1987.

Appendix

State University faculty salary methodoloy

Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee No. 5
Supplemental Report Language
The California State University
Item 6610-031-001

Faculty Salary Methodology. The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) shall convene the technical advisory committee on faculty salaries in order to evaluate whether the estimated average salaries at CSU's comparison institutions should be adjusted for the full effect, rather than the existing partial effect, of law school faculty in the comparison group. If CPEC determines that it is appropriate to retain the effect of any law school faculty in the computation of the comparison group's average salary, the commission shall clearly specify the justification for this decision. The CPEC shall report its recommendations to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the legislative fiscal committees by April 30, 1989. It is the intent of the Legislature that if any changes in the law school adjustment are found to be warranted, they shall not take effect until 1991-92.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of April 1989, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles;
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach;
Henry Der, San Francisco;
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco;
Helen Z. Hansen, Long Beach;
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero; *Vice Chair;*
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles;
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto; *Chair;* and
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto.

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California;

Theodore J. Saenger, San Francisco; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University;

John F. Parkhurst, Folsom; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges;

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions;

Francis Laufenberg, Orange; appointed by the California State Board of Education; and

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by the Governor from nominees proposed by California's independent colleges and universities.

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including community colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other State agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to speak at a meeting may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of the meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, Kenneth B. O'Brien, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514-3985; telephone (916) 445-7933.

Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 89-22

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

89-4 The Effectiveness of the Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) Program's Administrative and Policy-Making Processes: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 610 (1985) (January 1989)

89-5 Comments on the Community Colleges' Study of Students with Learning Disabilities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Report Language to the 1988 State Budget Act (January 1989)

89-6 Prospects for Accommodating Growth in Postsecondary Education to 2005: Report of the Executive Director to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, January 23, 1989 (January 1989)

89-7 State Budget Priorities of the Commission, 1989: A Report of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

89-8 Status Report on Human Corps Activities, 1989: The Second in a Series of Five Annual Reports to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 1820 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1987) (March 1989)

89-9 A Further Review of the California State University's Contra Costa Center (March 1989)

89-10 Out of the Shadows -- The IRCA/SLIAG Opportunity: A Needs Assessment of Educational Services for Eligible Legalized Aliens in California Under the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant Program of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 23, 1989, by California Tomorrow (March 1989)

89-11 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1989-90: A Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1989)

89-12 Teacher Preparation Programs Offered by California's Public Universities: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1988 State Budget Act (March 1989)

89-13 The State's Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation: A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 78 (Resolution Chapter 22, 1988) (March 1989)

89-14 Analysis of the Governor's Proposed 1989-90 Budget: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1989)

89-15 Planning Our Future: A Staff Background Paper on Long-Range Enrollment and Facilities Planning in California Public Higher Education (April 1989)

89-16 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1988: The Fourth in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (April 1989)

89-17 Protecting the Integrity of California Degrees: The Role of California's Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977 in Educational Quality Control (April 1989)

89-18 Recommendations for Revising the Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977: A Report to the Legislature and Governor on Needed Improvements in State Oversight of Privately Supported Postsecondary Education (April 1989)

89-19 Mandatory Statewide Student Fees in California's Public Four-Year Colleges and Universities: Report of the Sunset Review Committee on Statewide Student Fee Policy Under Senate Bill 195 (1985), published for the Committee by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (April 1989)

89-20 State Policy Guidelines for Adjusting Nonresident Tuition at California's Public Colleges and Universities: Report of the Advisory Committee on Nonresident Tuition Policies Under Senate Concurrent Resolution 69, published for the Committee by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (June 1989)

89-21 State Oversight of Postsecondary Education: Three Reports on California's Licensure of Private Institutions and Reliance on Non-Governmental Accreditation [A reprint of Reports 89-13, 89-17, and 89-18] (June 1989)

89-22 Revisions to the Commission's Faculty Salary Methodology for the California State University (June 1989)